

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

CARLOS RODRIQUEZ and
COLLEEN RODRIQUEZ

v.

CITY OF PHILADELPHIA

:
:
:
:
:
:

CIVIL ACTION

NO. 07-cv-04021-JF

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

Fullam, Sr. J.

July 30, 2008

Counsel for plaintiffs has filed a "Motion to Strike Objections and to Compel Production of Documents in Response to Plaintiffs' Supplemental Document Requests Dated June 23, 2008." The motion is accompanied by a "Memorandum of Law in Support of" the motion, but the Memorandum of Law is merely a verbatim copy of the motion itself. None of plaintiffs' recent filings provides a basis for determining precisely what additional documents plaintiffs are seeking. According to the defendant, plaintiff has already been supplied with all available documentation covering the information apparently being sought by plaintiffs (the hours worked by two named police officers, on specified dates).

Plaintiffs' motion will therefore be denied, without prejudice to a motion to compel which makes sense.

An Order follows.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

CARLOS RODRIQUEZ and
COLLEEN RODRIQUEZ

v.

CITY OF PHILADELPHIA

:
:
:
:
:

CIVIL ACTION

NO. 07-cv-04021-JF

ORDER

AND NOW, this 30th day of July 2008, upon consideration of plaintiffs' "Motion to Strike Objections and to Compel Production of Documents in Response to Plaintiffs' Supplemental Document Requests Dated June 23, 2008," and defendant's response, IT IS ORDERED:

that the motion is DENIED, without prejudice to plaintiffs' right to file a further application which makes sense.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ John P. Fullam
John P. Fullam, Sr. J.